REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 10, 21 and 28 to better clarify the invention. Support for the amendments is found in the specification on page 4, paragraph [0017] and page 6, paragraph [0022]. In addition, Applicants have added new dependent claims 35-38, support for those new claims is found in the specification on page 11, paragraph [0035 – 0037]. No new matter was added. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0091824). Applicants respectfully traverse this ground of rejection based upon the above amendments to the base claim and the following comments.

Applicant's independent Claims 1, as amended, recite an "electronic device in a local area network," comprising, *inter alia*, wherein said control verifies that said electronic device is installed in an authorized network and generates an alarm if said electronic device not present, wherein said user interface is configured to allow a user to arm and disarm a building intrusion detection features separately from security features of said LAN.

In contrast, Anderson discloses a computer system called a "reporting and maintenance system" (RMS) that acts as an intermediary between devices of an enterprise and a central management facility. (Page 2, paragraph [0017] and FIG. 3, reference character numeral 300). In other words, Anderson discloses the use of a SNMP protocol communicates the status of network devices in messages called protocol data units. No where in Anderson's disclosure does it disclose said control verifies that said electronic device is installed in an authorized network and generates an alarm if said electronic device not present, wherein said user interface is configured

to allow a user to arm and disarm a building intrusion detection features separately from security features of said LAN as recited in Claims 1of the present invention.

Therefore, Anderson fails to anticipate the present invention as recited in amended base Claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 21-24, 26 and 28-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Nagel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,181,017). Applicant respectfully traverses this ground of rejection based upon the above amendments to the base claim and the following comments.

Base Claims 21 and 28, as amended, recite an "electronic device in a local area network" and a "security system server," comprising, *inter alia*, wherein a control or control means verifies that said electronic device is installed in an authorized network and generates an alarm if said electronic device not present, wherein said user interface is configured to allow a user to arm and disarm a building intrusion detection features separately from security features of said LAN.

In contrast, Nagel discloses a system and method for communicating information between a first party and a second party to obscure at least a portion of the information from third party (Abstract of disclosure). In other words, Nagel fails to anticipate the present invention by disclosing a control or control means verifies that said electronic device is installed in an authorized network and generates an alarm if said electronic device not present, wherein said user interface is configured to allow a user to arm and disarm a building intrusion detection features separately from security features of said LAN as recited in base Claims 21 and 28.

Therefore, Nagel fails to anticipate the present invention as recited in amended base Claim 21 and 28. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

H:\work\1645\17268\Amend\17268.am2.doc

The Examiner has rejected Claims 7, 10 and 12-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0091824), and further in view of Davies (U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0024869). Applicant respectfully traverses this ground of rejection based upon the above amendments to the base claim and the following comments.

Claim 10, as amended, recites a security system, comprising *inter alia*, where a control sets an alarm if a response to the polling signal is not received from the electronic device to verifies that said electronic device is installed in an authorized network, wherein said network interface is configured to allow a user to arm and disarm a building intrusion detection features separately from security features of said LAN.

In contrast, Anderson as indicated above, fails to suggest or teach a control sets an alarm if a response to the polling signal is not received from the electronic device to verifies that said electronic device is installed in an authorized network, wherein said network interface is configured to allow a user to arm and disarm a building intrusion detection features separately from security features of said LAN. Accordingly, Anderson fails to suggest or teach either feature recited in the amended base Claim 10.

With regards to Davies, that patent application discloses an alarm server system, which teaches using SNMP polling to determine whether at least one interface of a network is failing (Abstract of Disclosure, page 4, paragraph [0035] and page 5, paragraph [0049]). In other words, Davies fails to suggest or teach a control sets an alarm if a response to the polling signal is not received from the electronic device to verifies that said electronic device is installed in an authorized network, wherein said network interface is configured to allow a user to arm and disarm a building intrusion detection features separately from security features of said LAN.

Accordingly, Davies fails to suggest or teach a control which <u>verifies that said electronic device is installed in an authorized network, wherein said network interface is configured to allow a user to arm and disarm a building intrusion detection features separately from security features of said LAN</u> as recited in amended base Claim 10.

Moreover, Applicant contents that the combination of Anderson with Davies fails to suggest or teach a control which <u>verifies that said electronic device is installed in an authorized network, wherein said network interface is configured to allow a user to arm and disarm a building intrusion detection features separately from security features of said LAN</u> as recited in amended base Claim 10.

Therefore, the Examiner has failed to make out a *prima facia* case of obviousness as the combined references fail to suggest or teach a control which <u>verifies that said electronic device is installed in an authorized network, wherein said network interface is configured to allow a user to arm and disarm a building intrusion detection features separately from security features of said LAN.</u>

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

With regards to the rejections of the dependent claims in the instant Office Action, Applicant contents that dependent Claims 2-9, 11-20, and 22-27 and 29-34 are dependent from base Claims 1, 10, 21 and 28 respectively and are now believed patentable due to the above mentioned amendments to the base claims and for at least the reasons stated above.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these grounds of rejection.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of all rejections, and allowance of all pending claims in due course.

H:\work\1645\17268\Amend\17268.am2.doc

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul J. Esatto, Jr.
Registration No. 30,749

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza - Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

PJE:DJD:tam

H:\work\1645\17268\Amend\17268.am2.doc